PROVISIONAL
For participants only

NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/SR.6
11 December 1990

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

FOURTH REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

MAIN COMMITTEE I

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 6th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 5 September 1990, at 4.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ADEYEMI (Nigeria)

CONTENTS

Consideration of the report of the Committee

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

GE.90-66129/5093a

The meeting was called to order at 5.10 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/L.1; NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/WG.1/CRP.1/Rev.4; NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/WG.2/CRP.2/Rev.3; NPT/CONF.IV/31; NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/WP.3)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider first of all the substantive part of its report, issued in draft form in document NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/L.1. He drew attention to the fact that documents NPT/CONF.IV/L.1 and NPT/CONF.IV/L.4 should also be listed under the heading "Documents containing elements relevant to a Final Declaration" in paragraph 4 of the draft report. The Secretariat would complete the information for inclusion in paragraph 5 ("Work of the Committee") and, in preparing the final version of the report, it would take account of any drafting changes agreed upon. In the absence of objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted all that part of its draft report which appeared in NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/L.1.

It was so decided.

Mr. AALBU (Norway), introducing the draft report of Working Group 1 (NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/WG.1/CRP.1/Rev.4), said that some delegations had expressed reservations concerning the final wording of some parts of the draft report. That was why paragraphs 8 and 9 had been enclosed in square brackets. Footnotes 1 and 2 provided the necessary explanation on those matters. Annexes I and II to the report contained two proposed texts, one from the United Kingdom and the other from Nigeria.

Mr. OWOSENI (Nigeria) noted that the text in paragraph 8 of the draft report, which was in square brackets, was identical to that in the Final Document of the 1985 Conference, except that there was naturally no mention of Namibia, which had since become independent. The Nigerian delegation would like to see the same wording retained, while taking due account of political developments in southern Africa.

Mr. KATSIGAZI (Uganda) agreed with the Nigerian delegation. He urged that the Final Document should contain a reference to the nuclear capabilities of South Africa and Israel and mention the role which could be played by an independent Namibia on the international scene.

Mr.JACOBY (Canada) said he had no objection to the deletion of the words in square brackets in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft report, but thought it preferable to retain the passages that were in square brackets in

paragraphs 5 and 7, in view of the concern caused by the development of nuclear programmes in some States non-parties to the Treaty. The important issue, still unresolved, was the matter of paragraphs 8 and 9. His delegation favoured either mentioning no specific country by name or naming all the countries that were in a position to acquire a nuclear capability, whose activities in that regard had not escaped the attention of the international community.

The CHAIRMAN said that he had spoken with Mr. Aalbu about the matter and thought that more time was needed to iron out differences of opinion. The Committee had not completed yet its work and negotiations were continuing. In the interest of making progress he proposed that the report of Working Group 1, as submitted by Mr. Aalbu, should be approved, but that the passages mentioned should be left in square brackets while negotiations continued.

Mrs. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO (Mexico) said that her delegation had no objection to make regarding the contents of document NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/L.1 and saw no reason why the Committee should not move on to consider the reports of Working Groups 1 and 2. She felt, however, that it was not appropriate to approve individual paragraphs of the report. Either they should approve the report as a whole or they should wait until all the relevant points had been settled.

The CHAIRMAN said he had proposed that the report should be adopted in its present form, including the square brackets, so that the Committee could move on and be in a position to submit a comprehensive document, already translated, to the Conference. The report, as a whole, should be adopted, not individual paragraphs.

Mr. CALDERON (Peru) said that the Committee was not at present adopting, but was simply taking note of the two reports submitted, while bearing in mind that consensus, had not yet been reached on certain paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Peru for that clarification and confirmed that the Committee's task was to take note of what had been done.

Mrs. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO (Mexico) said that her delegation took note of the three drafts which had been submitted, namely the substantive part of the Committee's report and the reports of Working Groups 1 and 2, on the understanding that that did not mean its acceptance or approval of individual paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that Main Committee I should take note of the reports and that the Secretariat should proceed with the translation of the documents. In the absence of objection, he would take it that the Committee approved his suggested course of action.

It was so decided.

Mr. MORADI (Iran) agreed with the Chairman that Main Committee I should continue with its work.

The Iranian delegation noted that there was no reference to the fact that paragraph 9 of the report and the footnotes had been submitted by the Chairman. It pointed out that paragraphs 1 to 8 had been prepared by Working Group 1, but that no decision had been taken with regard to the inclusion in the report of paragraph 9, the footnotes and the annexes. If the latter had been proposed by the Chairman, they should be presented separately, under an appropriate heading. His delegation reserved the right to comment later on the question of inclusion of that passage in the report.

The Iranian delegation regretted that Working Group 1 had not been able to reach agreement on paragraph 8 of the draft report. It reiterated that there was no definition of a "threshold" country and that it could not accept any wording which differed from that in paragraph 8. South Africa and Israel had refused to place their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards and the threat which those two countries represented were well known in their respective regions. The Iranian delegation hoped that Main Committee I and the Conference would succeed in producing a Final Document which would be adopted unanimously and would reflect in appropriate fashion the concern that had been expressed regarding the threat which the nuclear capabilities of South Africa and Israel constituted.

The CHAIRMAN said he did not think such an exchange of views would help to advance the Committee's work. The Committee's task, for the time being, was to take note of the reports, without amending their contents.

Mr. DEYANOV (Bulgaria), speaking as Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Security Assurances and of Working Group 2, recalled that the Sub-Committee had been established at the first meeting of Main Committee I to deal with agenda item 13 B (3) of the Conference and that Working Group 2 had been set up at the third meeting of the Committee.

The Sub-Committee on Security Assurances had held two regular and three informal meetings. Working Group 2 had held five meetings to draft the part of the report of Main Committee I relating to agenda items 13 A (3) and to

items 13 B (1), (2) and (3). Its duties with respect to drafting a report on the review of item 13 A (3), relating to Article VII of the Treaty, had been taken over by a working group established by Main Committee II.

The Sub-Committee on Security Assurances had considered in detail the proposed agreement on prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, submitted by Nigeria (NPT/CONF.IV/17), and the procedure for further action on that agreement. It had also considered the proposal by Egypt calling on the United Nations Security Council to adopt a new resolution on security assurances which would strengthen the provisions of Security Council resolution 255 (1968) (NPT/CONF.IV/31 and NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/WP.3).

The discussions in the Sub-Committee had revealed the high level of interest of States in enhancing the security of non-nuclear-weapon States Parties to the Treaty. However, the exchange of views on various aspects of the proposals had shown the complex nature of the issues involved.

The Sub-Committee had supported the objective of the proposal by Nigeria, but there had been insufficient time to arrive at a definite conclusion on the procedure for further action on the proposed agreement. The discussions had revealed some differences between delegations on the question. The proposal by Nigeria was currently the subject of intensive consultations, as was the proposal by Egypt.

Working Group 2 had completed the work of drafting the part of the Final Document relating to the review of the operation of the Treaty and recommendations with respect to security of non-nuclear-weapon States (NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/WG.2/CRP.2/Rev.3). The square brackets indicated those passages on which there was as yet no consensus. Shortage of time had prevented the Working Group from resolving the few remaining differences. He hoped that the intensive informal consultations which were taking place between delegations on the substance of the paragraphs in question would enable a consensus to be reached, either in Main Committee I or in the Drafting Committee.

Mr. ELM (Sweden), referring to paragraph 4 of the draft report submitted by Working Group 2 (NPT/CONF.IV/MC.I/WG.2/CRP.2/Rev.3), requested that the summary record should reflect his view that when assistance to a

country was envisaged under the provision referred to, that country should have the right to decide whether and how such assistance should be provided.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria) proposed that, in the interest of clarity, the words "of the Final Declaration" should be added in paragraph 4, after the reference to Annex II, and also after the references in paragraphs 6 and 12 of the draft report.

Mr. DEYANOV (Bulgaria) said that those purely technical errors would be corrected in the final wording of the report.

Mr. WEMBOU (Cameroon) said that his country supported the adoption of the document in its present form, even with the deletion of the square brackets in paragraph 13.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt the text, retaining the square brackets.

Mrs. GONZALES Y REYNERO (Mexico) said that in her delegation's view the Committee should only take note of the draft report, and not adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that adopting the report of Working Group 2 was not the same as adopting the report of Working Group 1. However, he was prepared to comply with the Mexican delegation's wishes if that delegation was not in a position to adopt the draft report.

Mrs. GONZALES Y REYNERO (Mexico) confirmed that at that juncture her delegation preferred to take note of the draft report of Working Group 2.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as Chairman of Working Group 3, which had the task of reviewing Article VI and preambular paragraphs 8-12 of the Treaty, said that because of the flood of proposals on that subject the second draft report was not yet available.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.